## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION



United States of America,	) Case No. CR 16 - 044
Plaintiff, v.	) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME ) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT FILED
Yolanda Brown	OCT 2 7 2016
Defendant.	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
by the continuance outweigh the best interest of	
Failure to grant a continuance wo See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	uld be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to each	plex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial lished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance wo taking into account the exercise of	ould deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance we counsel's other scheduled case counsel 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv	ould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ommitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance wo necessary for effective preparation See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv	ould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	$C_0 \rightarrow 0$
DATED: 0 27, 20/6	Sly 11/ Cyril
	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED:	1-7
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney